

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

Jerone McDougald,

Plaintiff,

v.

Jeremy Eaches, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:18-cv-00080

Judge Michael R. Barrett

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Magistrate Judge's October 15, 2019 Report and Recommendation ("R&R"). (Doc. 53). Proper notice has been given to the parties, including notice that the parties would waive further appeal if they failed to file objections to the R&R in a timely manner. *See United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). Plaintiff filed timely objections. (Doc. 56). Defendants filed a Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's objections. (Doc. 59). The Magistrate Judge provided a comprehensive review of the record in the R&R and the same will not be repeated here.

With respect to dispositive matters, and when the Court receives timely objections to an R&R, the assigned "district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). "The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions." *Id.*

The Magistrate Judge recommended that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment be granted, Plaintiff's pending motions be denied, and this case be dismissed with prejudice and closed. (Doc. 53). After a liberal review of Plaintiff's objections (Doc.

56), the Court finds the objections to be general disagreements with the R&R, which are insufficient to direct the Court's attention to a specific issue with the recommended grant of summary judgment in Defendants' favor. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (holding that the objections of a petitioner appearing pro se will be construed liberally); *Aldrich v. Bock*, 32 F.Supp. 2d 743, 747 (E.D. Mich. 2004) ("An 'objection' that does nothing more than state a disagreement with a magistrate [judge]'s suggested resolution, or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an 'objection' as that term is used in this context."). Plaintiff contends that the Magistrate Judge failed to properly evaluate the evidence and exhibits that he submitted with respect to each of his claims and argues that he clearly submitted evidence that creates a genuine issue of material fact regarding each of those claims. (Doc. 56). However, the Magistrate Judge explained why Plaintiff's proffered evidence is insufficient to overcome Defendants' well-supported Motion for Summary Judgment and Plaintiff's reiteration of his arguments and conclusory statements that the R&R is clearly incorrect does not convince the Court that the Magistrate Judge's recommendation is, in fact, incorrect. See FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3).

For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby **ORDERS** that the Magistrate Judge's October 15, 2019 R&R (Doc. 53) is **ADOPTED**. Consistent with those recommendations, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 36) is **GRANTED**, Plaintiff's remaining Motions (Docs. 38, 40, 52) are **DENIED**, this case is **DISMISSED with prejudice**, and closed and terminated from the Court's active docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Michael R. Barrett
Michael R. Barrett, Judge
United States District Court